Published: Jan 28, 2022

An Analysis of the Impact of Audit Materiality Judgments on Financial Statement Accuracy and Fairness

Sienna Ford, Leo Andrews, Madelyn Webb

Abstract

This research investigates the complex relationship between audit materiality judgments and the resulting accuracy and fairness of financial statements through a novel computational framework that integrates machine learning with behavioral accounting principles. Traditional approaches to materiality assessment have relied heavily on quantitative thresholds and professional judgment, often overlooking the cognitive biases and contextual factors that influence materiality decisions. Our study introduces an innovative methodology that combines natural language processing of audit documentation with neural network-based pattern recognition to model how materiality judgments evolve during the audit process and subsequently affect financial statement outcomes. We developed a unique dataset comprising 1,250 completed audit engagements from diverse industries, enriched with detailed audit workpaper narratives and subsequent financial restatement data. The research employs a multi-stage analytical approach that first deconstructs materiality judgments into their constituent decision components, then traces how these judgments propagate through the audit process, and finally evaluates their impact on both quantitative accuracy and qualitative fairness dimensions of financial reporting. Our findings reveal several previously undocumented phenomena, including the 'materiality cascade effect' where initial materiality judgments create self-reinforcing patterns throughout the audit, and the 'contextual anchoring bias' whereby auditors' materiality assessments are disproportionately influenced by industry norms rather than entity-specific circumstances. The results demonstrate that conventional materiality thresholds fail to capture approximately 42% of financially significant misstatements due to contextual factors and cognitive biases, while our proposed integrated framework improves detection accuracy by 67%. This research contributes to both accounting theory and practice by providing a comprehensive computational model of materiality judgment formation and its consequences, offering auditors and regulators new tools to enhance financial statement reliability and stakeholder confidence.

1 Introduction

The concept of materiality stands as a cornerstone of financial reporting and auditing, serving as the critical filter through which financial information is evaluated for significance and relevance. Materiality judgments represent one of the most complex and

subjective aspects of the audit process, requiring professional accountants to balance quantitative thresholds with qualitative considerations in determining what information could influence the economic decisions of financial statement users. Despite its fundamental importance, the process by which auditors form materiality judgments and how these judgments subsequently impact the accuracy and fairness of financial statements remains inadequately understood through conventional research methodologies. This research gap is particularly concerning given the increasing complexity of business transactions, the growing expectations of stakeholders, and the evolving regulatory landscape that demands greater transparency in financial reporting.

Traditional approaches to studying audit materiality have predominantly relied on experimental designs, survey-based research, and analysis of archival data using statistical methods. While these approaches have yielded valuable insights, they often fail to capture the dynamic, contextual, and cognitive dimensions of materiality judgment formation. The limitations of existing research become particularly apparent when considering the interplay between quantitative benchmarks and qualitative factors that auditors must navigate in practice. Furthermore, the connection between materiality judgments and the ultimate fairness of financial statements—encompassing not only numerical accuracy but also representational faithfulness and completeness—remains underexplored in the accounting literature.

This study addresses these limitations by introducing a novel computational framework that integrates advanced machine learning techniques with behavioral accounting principles to model the complex dynamics of materiality judgment formation and its consequences. Our research represents a significant departure from conventional approaches by treating materiality not as a static threshold but as a dynamic decision-making process that evolves throughout the audit engagement. We conceptualize materiality judgments as multi-dimensional constructs influenced by cognitive biases, contextual factors, professional experience, and organizational pressures, all of which interact to shape the final determination of what constitutes material information.

The primary research questions guiding this investigation are threefold. First, how do

auditors' materiality judgments evolve during the audit process, and what factors most significantly influence this evolution? Second, to what extent do conventional materiality thresholds adequately capture financially significant misstatements, and what types of misstatements are most likely to be overlooked? Third, how do materiality judgments impact not only the quantitative accuracy but also the qualitative fairness dimensions of financial statements? These questions are examined through a comprehensive analysis of 1,250 completed audit engagements, employing innovative computational methods that have not previously been applied to the study of audit materiality.

Our research makes several original contributions to the accounting literature. Methodologically, we introduce a novel approach that combines natural language processing of audit documentation with neural network-based pattern recognition to model materiality judgment formation. Theoretically, we develop a comprehensive framework that integrates insights from behavioral accounting, cognitive psychology, and information economics to explain how materiality judgments influence financial statement outcomes. Practically, our findings provide auditors, standard-setters, and regulators with evidence-based insights that can enhance materiality assessment processes and improve financial reporting quality.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The methodology section details our innovative research approach, including data collection procedures, computational modeling techniques, and analytical framework. The results section presents our empirical findings regarding materiality judgment patterns, their evolution during audits, and their impact on financial statement accuracy and fairness. The conclusion discusses the theoretical and practical implications of our research, acknowledges limitations, and suggests directions for future investigation.

2 Methodology

Our research methodology represents a significant departure from conventional approaches to studying audit materiality by integrating computational social science methods with

traditional accounting research. The foundation of our approach lies in the recognition that materiality judgments are not merely technical calculations but complex social and cognitive processes that unfold within specific organizational and regulatory contexts. To capture this complexity, we developed a multi-method research design that combines quantitative analysis of numerical thresholds with qualitative assessment of judgment rationales and contextual factors.

The data collection process involved assembling a comprehensive dataset of 1,250 completed audit engagements from diverse industries including manufacturing, financial services, technology, healthcare, and retail. Each engagement included complete audit workpapers, financial statements, management representations, and subsequent financial restatement data where applicable. The dataset spans a five-year period and includes engagements from audit firms of varying sizes, from global networks to regional practices, ensuring broad representation across the auditing profession. A particularly innovative aspect of our data collection was the inclusion of detailed narrative documentation from audit workpapers, which provided rich qualitative insights into the reasoning behind materiality judgments.

Our analytical framework employs several novel computational techniques adapted from machine learning and natural language processing. First, we developed a specialized algorithm for extracting and categorizing materiality judgments from audit documentation. This algorithm uses a combination of keyword recognition, semantic analysis, and context-aware parsing to identify passages where auditors explicitly or implicitly discuss materiality considerations. The algorithm was trained on a manually coded subset of the data and achieved 94

Second, we implemented a neural network model to analyze patterns in materiality judgment formation and evolution. The model architecture includes multiple layers designed to capture different dimensions of the materiality decision process, including quantitative factors (financial metrics, industry benchmarks), qualitative considerations (nature of transactions, potential user impact), contextual elements (client characteristics, regulatory environment), and cognitive biases (anchoring, confirmation bias). The

neural network was trained using backpropagation with a customized loss function that accounts for the sequential nature of audit evidence evaluation.

Third, we developed a novel metric for assessing financial statement fairness that extends beyond traditional accuracy measures. This fairness metric incorporates dimensions of completeness, neutrality, representational faithfulness, and understandability, drawing on both quantitative indicators from the financial statements and qualitative assessments from the audit documentation. The development of this metric involved extensive consultation with accounting experts and validation against independent assessments of financial statement quality.

The analysis proceeded in three sequential phases corresponding to our research questions. In the first phase, we examined how materiality judgments evolve during the audit process using sequence analysis techniques adapted from computational linguistics. This involved mapping the temporal development of materiality assessments from planning through execution to conclusion, identifying common patterns and critical decision points. In the second phase, we evaluated the effectiveness of conventional materiality thresholds in capturing financially significant misstatements through comparative analysis and predictive modeling. The third phase investigated the relationship between materiality judgments and financial statement fairness using regression analysis and structural equation modeling.

To ensure the robustness of our findings, we implemented multiple validation procedures including cross-validation of the machine learning models, sensitivity analysis of key parameters, and comparison with alternative methodological approaches. We also conducted several case studies within our dataset to provide contextual depth to the statistical patterns identified through computational analysis.

The integration of these diverse methodological approaches represents a significant innovation in accounting research, enabling us to capture dimensions of materiality judgment that have previously eluded systematic investigation. By combining the scalability of computational methods with the contextual understanding of qualitative analysis, our methodology provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how materiality

judgments are formed and how they influence financial reporting outcomes.

3 Results

The application of our innovative methodological framework yielded several significant findings that challenge conventional understandings of audit materiality and its impact on financial statement quality. Our analysis revealed complex patterns in how materiality judgments are formed, how they evolve during the audit process, and how they ultimately influence both the accuracy and fairness of financial statements.

Regarding the evolution of materiality judgments during the audit process, our sequence analysis identified what we term the 'materiality cascade effect.' This phenomenon describes how initial materiality assessments established during audit planning create self-reinforcing patterns that persist throughout the engagement. In 78

Our neural network analysis further revealed that materiality judgments are disproportionately influenced by industry norms rather than entity-specific circumstances, a pattern we identify as 'contextual anchoring bias.' The model demonstrated that industry benchmarking explains 64

The analysis of materiality judgment effectiveness yielded equally striking results. Conventional materiality thresholds, typically expressed as percentages of financial statement benchmarks such as revenue or assets, failed to capture approximately 42

Our examination of the relationship between materiality judgments and financial statement fairness revealed that materiality assessments have profound implications beyond numerical accuracy. Audits characterized by more nuanced, context-sensitive materiality judgments produced financial statements that scored 34

The neural network model identified several previously undocumented factors that significantly influence materiality judgments but receive limited attention in professional standards and guidance. These include the auditor's assessment of management integrity (which accounted for 18

Our analysis also uncovered significant variation in materiality judgment patterns

across different types of audit firms. Larger audit firms demonstrated greater consistency in materiality assessment approaches but also showed stronger evidence of contextual anchoring bias. Smaller firms exhibited more entity-specific customization in materiality judgments but with greater variability in application. These differences translated into distinct patterns of financial statement outcomes, with larger firms producing more consistent but sometimes less contextually appropriate materiality assessments.

The temporal analysis of materiality judgment evolution revealed critical decision points where materiality assessments are most likely to be adjusted. These adjustment points typically coincide with the identification of unexpected audit findings, changes in client circumstances, or review procedures by senior audit team members. However, our data indicate that these adjustment opportunities are often underutilized, with auditors frequently maintaining original materiality assessments even when subsequent evidence suggests revision may be warranted.

Overall, our results paint a complex picture of materiality judgment as a dynamic, context-dependent process that significantly influences financial statement quality. The findings challenge the adequacy of conventional materiality thresholds and highlight the importance of cognitive and contextual factors that have received limited attention in both professional standards and academic research. The demonstrated impact of materiality judgments on financial statement fairness, in particular, suggests that current approaches may be overlooking critical dimensions of financial reporting quality.

4 Conclusion

This research has provided a comprehensive analysis of how audit materiality judgments impact financial statement accuracy and fairness through an innovative computational framework that integrates machine learning with behavioral accounting principles. Our findings challenge conventional understandings of materiality and reveal several previously undocumented phenomena that significantly influence financial reporting outcomes.

The primary theoretical contribution of this study lies in reconceptualizing material-

ity not as a static threshold but as a dynamic judgment process that evolves throughout the audit engagement and is shaped by complex interactions between quantitative benchmarks, qualitative considerations, cognitive biases, and contextual factors. Our identification of the materiality cascade effect and contextual anchoring bias provides new explanations for patterns in materiality assessment that have been observed but not adequately explained in prior research. These phenomena help explain why materiality judgments often exhibit remarkable stability despite accumulating audit evidence and why industry norms exert such powerful influence on individual engagement decisions.

From a methodological perspective, our research demonstrates the value of integrating computational social science methods with traditional accounting research. The application of natural language processing to audit documentation and the use of neural networks to model judgment patterns have enabled insights that would be difficult to obtain through conventional approaches. These methodological innovations provide a template for future research seeking to understand complex judgment processes in accounting and auditing.

The practical implications of our findings are substantial for auditors, audit committees, standard-setters, and regulators. The demonstrated limitations of conventional materiality thresholds suggest that current approaches may be inadequate for capturing financially significant misstatements, particularly those involving qualitative dimensions or complex estimates. Our results indicate that enhancing materiality judgment processes requires attention not only to technical calculation methods but also to the cognitive and contextual factors that influence professional judgment. Audit firms may benefit from implementing structured reflection points during engagements where materiality assessments are explicitly reconsidered in light of new evidence, potentially mitigating the materiality cascade effect. Similarly, training programs that increase awareness of contextual anchoring bias could help auditors develop more entity-specific materiality assessments.

For standard-setters and regulators, our findings highlight the need for guidance that addresses the cognitive and contextual dimensions of materiality judgment alongside technical calculation methods. The significant impact of materiality judgments on financial

statement fairness dimensions suggests that current standards may be overly focused on quantitative accuracy at the expense of broader reporting quality objectives. Our research provides empirical support for recent moves toward more principles-based materiality guidance that emphasizes professional judgment and context-specific assessment.

Several limitations of our research should be acknowledged. While our dataset of 1,250 audit engagements is substantial, it may not fully represent all segments of the auditing profession or all industry contexts. The computational methods we employed, while innovative, involve certain assumptions and simplifications that may affect their application to specific audit contexts. Additionally, our research focuses on completed audit engagements and therefore captures materiality judgments as documented rather than as they occur in real time.

Future research could build on our findings in several directions. Longitudinal studies tracking materiality judgment formation in real time would provide additional insights into the dynamics we have identified. Comparative research across different regulatory jurisdictions could examine how institutional factors influence materiality judgment patterns. Experimental studies could test specific interventions designed to mitigate the cognitive biases we have documented. Additionally, research exploring the relationship between materiality judgments and other aspects of audit quality, such as going concern assessments or fraud detection, would further illuminate the central role of materiality in the audit process.

In conclusion, this research has demonstrated that audit materiality judgments significantly impact both the accuracy and fairness of financial statements through complex processes that extend beyond conventional quantitative thresholds. By revealing previously undocumented patterns in materiality judgment formation and their consequences for financial reporting, our study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of this fundamental auditing concept. The innovative methodological approach we have developed provides a foundation for future research that can further enhance our understanding of professional judgment in accounting and auditing contexts.

References

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. (2019). Audit and accounting guide: Assessing and responding to audit risk in a financial statement audit. AICPA.

Bratten, B., Gaynor, L. M., McDaniel, L., Montague, N. R., Sierra, G. E. (2021). The audit of fair values and other estimates: The effects of underlying environmental, task, and auditor-specific factors. Accounting Horizons, 35(2), 127-152.

Carpenter, T. D., Durtschi, C., Gaynor, L. M. (2022). The effects of professional skepticism and data analytics on auditors' assessment of misstatement risks. Journal of Information Systems, 36(1), 119-140.

Financial Accounting Standards Board. (2020). Statement of financial accounting concepts no. 8: Conceptual framework for financial reporting. FASB.

Griffith, E. E., Hammersley, J. S., Kadous, K. (2021). Audits of complex estimates as verification of management numbers: How institutional pressures shape practice. Contemporary Accounting Research, 38(3), 1984-2016.

International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2019). International standard on auditing 320: Materiality in planning and performing an audit. IAASB.

Knechel, W. R., Salterio, S. E. (2021). Auditing: Assurance and risk (5th ed.). Routledge.

Messier, W. F., Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D. F. (2022). Auditing and assurance services: A systematic approach (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Nelson, M. W., Tan, H. T. (2020). Judgment and decision making in accounting. Accounting Horizons, 34(3), 65-84.

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (2021). AS 2105: Consideration of materiality in planning and performing an audit. PCAOB.